



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Journal, December, 1881.

On the use of *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, and Connected Words in the Sacred Writings.

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D. D., LL. D.

The words נֶפֶשׁ and רֹחַ in Hebrew, *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα* in Greek, anima and spiritus in Latin, Seele and Geist in German, soul and ghost or spirit in English, are all alike derived from roots meaning air or some movement of air, as breathing, or a waving of the wind. In classical Greek *ψυχή* came to stand for the mind, the inner man, the immortal part of man; and, what is remarkable, it came to have a special reference to the departed spirits or shades; while נֶפֶשׁ, the corresponding Hebrew word, came to designate the dead body. The classical Greek never carried *πνεῦμα* beyond its physical sense, though the later Greek began to use it for life or the living being.

In the following paper it will be understood that, for the sake of greater brevity, whenever the English words soul and spirit are employed in reference to Old Testament passages, they correspond to the Hebrew words נֶפֶשׁ and רֹחַ, and in connection with the New Testament passages, to *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, respectively; unless some other word is expressly given as the original term.

Spirit and soul are used interchangeably, or as parallel and equivalent expressions; each for the whole inner man, the whole man exclusive of the body; and both having the same predicates.

Isa. xxvi. 9, "With my soul have I desired thee, yea with my

spirit within me will I seek thee"; lvii. 16, "The spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made"; Luke i. 46, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour"; Phil. i. 27, "Stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving together"; Luke x. 21, "Rejoiced in spirit"; John xi. 33, "Groaned in spirit"; xiii. 21, "Troubled in spirit"; Mark viii. 12, "Sighed deeply in his spirit"; Acts xvii. 16, "Spirit stirred within him"; xviii. 5, "Pressed in spirit";—John xii. 27, "My soul is troubled"; 2 Pet. ii. 8, "Vexed his righteous soul"; Matt. xi. 29, "Ye shall find rest unto your souls"; xxvi. 38, and Mark xiv. 34, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful"; Luke ii. 35, "A sword shall pierce through thine own soul"; Gen. xlii. 21, "We saw the anguish of his soul"; Lev. xv. 29, 31, "Shall afflict your souls"; 1 Sam. i. 10, "She was in bitterness of soul", (also Job iii. 10); Jud. xvi. 16, "His soul was vexed", also Ps. vi. 3, &c.;—Gen. xli. 8, "Spirit troubled"; Ex. vi. 9, "anguish of spirit"; Job. vii. 11, "I will speak in the anguish of my spirit"; see also "a broken spirit", "a wounded spirit", "vexation of spirit", &c.

Thus the same affections are ascribed indiscriminately to the soul and to the spirit; and one stands for the man himself as much as the other.

The soul and the body are represented as constituting the whole man. Matt. x. 28, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna"; see also Luke xii. 5. Here "soul" is more than "the life"; for *that* man can destroy; it is the living being;—and Gehenna is more than the grave or the valley of Hinnom; for, according to St. Luke, man cannot cast into it. Here, too, it is plain the soul and the body are all there is of man. Micah vi. 7, "Fruit of my body for the sin of my soul"; Isa. x. 18, "Both soul and body"; Gen. xxxv. 18, "Her soul was in departing"; 1 Kings xix. 21, 22, "Let this child's soul come into him again."

Still more frequently are the spirit and body, in immediate contrast, thus represented:—Luke viii. 55, "Her spirit came again and she arose"; so, "into thy hands I commend my spirit"; "receive my spirit"; 1 Cor. vi. 20, "Glorify God in your body and in your spirit"; vii. 34, "Holy both in body and in spirit"; Eph. iv. 4, "One body, one spirit"; James ii. 26, "As the body without the spirit is dead," (where the spirit is recognized as the animating principle for the body); so Rev. xi. 11, "The spirit of life from God entered into them."

Our Lord himself contrasts spirit with flesh, *σὰρξ*; never with body, *σῶμα*. "That which is born of the flesh," says he, "is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Here flesh does not mean the body, but the whole natural man, that which is the product or the result of natural generation; while the spirit does not denote what was in the man before as a constituent part of him, but that which is produced in him by the regenerating agency of the Divine Spirit. St. Paul uses flesh and spirit in the same way. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit," says he, "and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would", (Gal. v. 17); and again, "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh but in the spirit." Whence it is manifest that flesh is not synonymous with body, for they were in the body.

When, on another occasion, our Lord says, "the spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak", the flesh may mean much the same as body; but if so, the spirit means the same as soul or heart or mind; and thus the distinction is equivalent to that between soul and body.

There are a few other passages where spirit and flesh are brought into contrast or juxtaposition,—particularly Heb. xii. 9, 10: "Furthermore, the fathers of our flesh we had as chasteners, and we revered them; shall we not much rather submit ourselves unto the Father of the [our?] spirits and live?" This has been variously interpreted; and it has been cited as proving the doctrine of creationism, *i. e.*, that each human soul is created for each human body by an act of God. But this seems to ignore the fact that God is the maker of our bodies as well as of our spirits or souls; see Ps. cxxxix. 13-16. The allusion may be to the original Divine inbreathing whereby "man became a living soul"; or to the regenerating energy of the Divine Spirit. The *soul* is also spoken of much in the same way in Isa. lvii. 16: "The spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." For other passages similar to that in Hebrews, see Numb. xvi. 22: "O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh"; xxvii. 1, "The Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh"; Job. xii. 10, "In whose hand is the soul (נִשְׁמָה) of all life, and the breath (רוּחַ) of all human flesh"; xxvii. 3, "The Spirit of God is in my nostrils"; xxxiii. 4, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath (נִשְׁמָה) of the Almighty hath given me life." In these passages the Spirit seems to stand for the breath or the animating principle in man; and God is simply represented as the author and

preserver of our lives, with special reference, it may be, to our minds.

Spirit and heart, soul and heart, are also used interchangeably and by way of parallelism:—Isa. li. 15, “To revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones”; Deut. ii. 30, “God hardened his spirit and made his heart,” &c.; Ps. li. 10, “Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me”; li. 17, “The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart,” &c.; Ezek. xviii. 21, “A new heart and a new spirit”;—as for heart and soul, see Matt. xxii. 37, “With all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind”; see also Mark xii. 30, and Luke xii. 19; Acts iv. 32, “Of one heart and of one soul”; Deut. iv. 29, “If thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul”; see also vi. 5; x. 12; xi. 13; xiii. 3; xxvi. 16, “Keep and do them with all thine heart and with all thy soul”; xxx. 2, “Obey with all thy heart and with all thy soul”; Joshua xxii. 5, “Serve him with all your heart and with all your soul”; xxiii. 14, “Ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls”; 2 Kings xxiii. 3, 25, “To keep his commandments with all their heart and with all their soul”; 1 Chron. xxii. 19, “Set your heart and your soul to seek the Lord”; Eph. vi. 5, 6, “In singleness of your heart, . . . doing the will of God from the soul”; and so, Col. iii. 22, 23, “In singleness of heart, fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do it from the soul.”

Spirit and mind are both contrasted and conjoined. In 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15, spirit and *νοῦς* are contrasted: “My spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also.” In Eph. iv. 23, they are conjoined or merged: “Renewed in the spirit of your mind, *νοῦς*.” In 1 Cor. ii. 11, “The spirit of man in him” stands for his conscious being, it *knows* the things of the man.

Sin, perversion, pollution, are predicated alike of the soul, the spirit, the heart, and the mind. Lev. iv. 2, “If a soul sin;” see also, vi. 2, etc.; xvii. 11, “Make an atonement for your souls” (here soul may mean merely the person); Hab. ii. 4, “His soul is not upright in him”; Ezek. xviii. 4, “The soul that sinneth, it shall die”; xxxvi. 5, “With despiteful minds (souls)”; Micah. vi. 7, “The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul”; Acts xv. 24, “Subverting your souls”; 1 Pet. i. 22, “Ye have purified your souls”; 2 Pet. ii. 14, “Beguiling unstable souls”; Deut. ii. 10, “God hardened his spirit”; Judges ix. 23; 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 15, &c., “An evil spirit”; 1 Kings xxii. 21, 22, &c., “A lying spirit”; Ezek. xviii. 21, “A new heart and a new spirit”; see in Gospels, “Unclean spirits”; 2 Cor. vii. 1, “Filthiness of the flesh and spirit”; James iv. 5,

"The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy";—for "heart" no citations are needed;—for "mind," Eph. ii. 3, "desires of the flesh of the mind (*διανοία*)"; Col. i. 21, "Enemies in mind (*διανοία*) by wicked works"; 2 Cor. xi. 3, "So your minds (*νοήματα*) should be corrupted"; Rom. i. 28, "Reprobate mind (*νοῦς*)"; Col. ii. 18, "Puffed up by his fleshly mind (*νοῦς*)"; 1 Tim. vi. 5, "Corrupt minds (*νοῦς*)"; Tit. i. 15, "Mind (*νοῦς*) and conscience is defiled"; Rom. viii. 7, "The mind of the flesh (*φρόνημα σαρκός*) is enmity against God."

Righteousness and purity are similarly predicated, but no texts are needed in proof.

Life after death, future punishment and salvation, are predicated alike of the soul and of the spirit.

Job xxxii. 22, "His soul dwelleth near unto Sheol"; Ps. xvi. 10, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol"; xxx. 3, "Brought up my soul from Sheol"; Matt. x. 28, "Destroy both soul and body in Gehenna"; John xii. 25, "He that hateth his life (*ψυχὴ*) in this world shall keep it unto life (*ζωή*) eternal"; Matt. x. 39, "He that findeth his life (*ψυχὴ*) shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it"; also, xvi. 25, 27; Mark viii. 35, 38,— "Whosoever shall lose his life (*ψυχὴ*) for my sake and the Gospel's, the same shall save it," &c.; also, Luke ix. 24, 27; 2 Cor. xii. 15, "I will most gladly spend and be spent for your souls"; Heb. vi. 19, "An anchor of the soul"; 1 Peter ii. 11, 25, "Fleshly lusts, which war against the soul"; "The shepherd and bishop of your souls"; Heb. x. 39, "Saving of the soul"; James i. 21, "Able to save your souls"; 1 Pet. i. 9, "Salvation of your souls"; iv. 19, "Commit the keeping of your souls to him"; Rom. ii. 7, 9, "To those who seek immortality, eternal life, but tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil"; Rev. vi. 9, "I saw under the altar the souls," &c.; xx. 4, "I saw the souls of them which were beheaded," &c.;—Ps. xxxi. 5, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit"; see also Luke xxiii. 46; Eccles. iii. 21, the spirit of man that goeth upward"; xii. 7, "The spirit shall return unto God who gave it"; 1 Cor. v. 5, "That the spirit may be saved"; Heb. xii. 23, "Spirits of just men made perfect"; 1 Pet. iii. 19, "The spirits in prison."

Both *נַפְשׁ* and *ψυχὴ* are sometimes, but particularly *ψυχὴ*, used in a sort of wavering sense between what we express by "life" and what we express by "soul," or as combining both senses. See the already quoted passages, John xii. 25; Matt. x. 39; xvi. 26, &c.; Mark viii. 35-37; and Luke ix. 24, 25.

Sometimes נֶפֶשׁ is used of the life of *brutes*. Gen. i. 21, 24; "Every living creature that moveth," "The living creature after his kind"; ii. 19, "Every living creature"; ix. 4, "Flesh with the life thereof . . . shall ye not eat"; iv. 12, 15, 16, "Every living creature"; Lev. xxiv. 18, "Flesh with the life thereof"; also, xvii. 11, 14, and Deut. xii. 23; Numb. xxxi. 28, "One soul of five hundred both of the persons and of the beeves"; Job xii. 10, "The soul of every living thing, and the spirit (רוּחַ) of all mankind."

These fourteen are all the cases that I can find in the Old Testament in which the Hebrew word has this application. In the New Testament there are but two cases of ψυχή so used; Rev. viii. 9, "All which were in the sea and had life died"; and xvi. 3, "And every living soul died in the sea."

On the other hand, רֶחַח is used of *beasts* six times; Gen. vi. 17, "All flesh wherein is the breath of life"; so also, vii. 15, 22; Ps. civ. 29, "Thou takest away their breath (רֶחַח)"; Eccles. iii. 19, "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts . . . yea they have all one breath (רֶחַח)"; 21, "The spirit of the beast that goeth downward."

And נֶפֶשׁ is used of God in the Old Testament nine times; Jud. xvi. 16, "His soul was grieved for the misery of the children of Israel"; Isa. i. 14, "My soul hateth"; xiii. 2, "In whom my soul delighteth"; Jerem. v. 9 and ix. 9, "Shall not my soul be avenged?" xii. 7, "The dearly beloved of my soul"; xiv. 19, "Hath thy soul loathed Zion?" xxxii. 41, "With my whole heart and with my whole soul"; Lev. xxvi. 11, "My soul shall not abhor you." In the New Testament ψυχή is so applied twice; Matt. xii. 18, "In whom my soul is well pleased;" and Heb. x. 38, "My soul shall have no pleasure in him":—both cited from the Septuagint.

In general נֶפֶשׁ and ψυχή are distinguished from רֶחַח and ζωή. The latter stand for life, living, in the *abstract*, (though רֶחַח is also frequently used concretely, both as an adjective and for ζωή). But the former are always *concrete*, and stand for somewhat that lives, either the vital principle itself or the living being; and so they come to represent the person, the soul, the self; which רֶחַח and ζωή never do. This is the strongest evidence that they stand for the whole inner man; for the

centre of the consciousness of our inner being. Life (חַי) and soul (נַפְשׁ) are contradistinguished: Job x, 1, "My soul is weary of my life"; Ps. lxi. 9, "Which holdeth our soul in life"; Prov. iii. 22, "So shall they be life unto thy soul"; see also John xii. 25, c c. For ζωή see also 1 Pet. iii. 10, "He that will love life,"—this is very different from loving his life, *ψυχή*; Jas. iv. 14, "What is your life? it is even a vapour"; 1 Tim. iv. 8, "Having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come"; 1 Cor. xv. 18, "If in 'this life only,' &c. Of *ψυχή* such propositions are never made.

But as נַפְשׁ and *ψυχή* stand thus for the vital or animating principle, so also do רֵיחַ and *πνεῦμα*; as, "all flesh wherein is the breath of life," (Gen. v. 17; vii. 15, 22; &c.); "Her spirit came again and she arose," (Luke viii. 55); "As the body without the spirit is dead," (Jas. ii. 26.)

As the soul is the seat of the affections, so also, as we have seen, is the spirit. On the other hand, as the spirit is used for the rational mind, which is conscious of the things of man that are in him; so, also the soul *knows, thinks, remembers*: Psalms cxxxix. 14, "my soul knoweth right well"; Prov. xix. 2, "That the soul be without knowledge is not good"; 1 Sam. xx 4, "What thy soul speaketh"; Lam. iii. 20, "My soul hath them still in remembrance"; Josh. xxiii. 14, "Ye know in all your hearts, and in all your souls," &c.

As soul stands familiarly for the person, the self, the ego, so that "my soul," "thy soul," "his soul," often mean—though always probably with a certain peculiar modification of sense—the same as *I, thou, he*;—so also is the spirit used. Thus, Isa. xxxviii. 16, "In all these things is the life of my spirit; so wilt thou recover me and make me live"; "where "Life of my spirit" is *my life*; "My spirit" is myself, just as "My soul" is I. So also, "Hath refreshed my spirit and yours," (1 Cor. xvi. 18, also 2 Cor. vii. 13), *i. e.*, me and you. And thus, when, to the salutation: "The Lord be with you," it is answered, "And with thy spirit,"—"Thy spirit" means simply *thee*.

In Job xxxii. 8, it seems to be implied that the spirit, רֵיחַ, belongs to man naturally; and the natural understanding is said to come into it, as it were, from the Spirit of God: "But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration (נְשִׁיחַ) of the Almighty giveth him understanding.

That what is called *πνεῦμα* is *naturally* in man as well as what is called *ψυχή* is further evident from the words of St. Paul, which occur

in immediate connexion with his contrast of the natural or psychical with the spiritual or pneumatical man: "For who of men," says he, "Knoweth the things of man (or of the man, or man in general) save the spirit of man (or of the man) which is in him?" This spirit, then, belongs to man as man, to all men; and it is here regarded as the seat of human consciousness.

Thus then we have seen that:

(1) Spirit and soul are used indiscriminately for the whole inner man.

(2) The same predicates, the same affections, are ascribed to both.

(3) Soul and body, or spirit and body, stand alike for the whole man.

(4) Spirit and flesh have sometimes a special contrast, but not as being constituent parts of our natural constitution.

(5) Heart is used interchangeably with spirit or with soul.

(6) Spirit and mind are contrasted as well as conjoined.

(7) Sin, pollution, perversion, as well as righteousness and purity, are predicated alike of soul, spirit, heart and mind.

(8) Life after death, future punishment and salvation are predicated alike of the soul and of the spirit.

(9) Spirit and soul are both used for the principle of life, the animating principle in the body.

(10) Both terms are used for the life of beasts; and both are used in respect to God, in the New Testament as well as in the Old.

(11) Both are used to denote not only the seat of the affections, but the rational conscious mind and the proper personal self.

Let us turn now to some points of view in which the two terms or things are discriminated.

That נֶפֶשׁ and (in the Septuagint) ψυχή should come to stand for a *dead body*, is a remarkable and startling fact. But this is explained by considering that the body is regarded as having been alive; and that, to the eye, the body represents the *person*. Indeed, in our ordinary English, we have remarkable traces of a converse usage, viz., of "body" for person; as anybody, everybody, somebody, nobody, busy-body, &c.,—terms which we never apply to the lower animals, and which mean, therefore, not individual bodies, but proper persons. Besides we may note the tendency in the vulgar thought and speech in general to degrade *person* to *body*, as in the phrases, "He has a fine person", "To adorn the person", "His personal appearance or bearing", &c. And thus there is danger that that most refined and elevated philosophical conception of personality should be by many people

entirely missed, or merged in mere corporeity. It may be added that, in imitation of Scripture language, we also, in current English, use *soul* for *person* numerically, as "Every soul on board", "more than twenty souls", &c. In neither of the above mentioned ways is spirit ever used.

On the other hand, the special uses of spirit are:

(1) To indicate the Spirit of God, the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit.

(2) In the Acts of the Apostles frequently, and sometimes elsewhere, to indicate his miraculous gifts, or with special reference to them; but, in Cor. xii. 4-11, these are emphatically distinguished in their diversity from the one giver. In 1 Cor. xiv. 12, spiritual gifts are called *πνεύματα* (in the plural).

(3) To denote devils or demons, "evil or foul spirits"; and good angels, "ministering spirits."

(4) To denote temper, disposition, character; as, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of", (Luke ix. 55); "A meek and quiet spirit", (1 Pet. iii. 4); so "a spirit of meekness", "of love", &c.; and "spirit of your mind."

In none of these senses is soul ever used.

The question now arises, is man's nature in the Scripture regarded as bipartite or tripartite?

In the first place, the discriminations just mentioned in the Scripture usage of the terms soul and spirit, when compared with the great mass of indiscriminate usage, can hardly be urged as a sufficient ground for regarding soul and spirit as distinct hypostases, as contradistinguished constituent parts, of man's natural constitution.

In the second place, by our Lord and by the Evangelists, only a two-fold division is recognized;—it is either "soul and body" or "spirit and body." "Soul and spirit" are never discriminated. In one case only the two are placed in juxtaposition, and that in Mary's magnificat; where they are in parallelism and mean the same thing. Such also is the *general* usage of the New Testament writers, St. Paul included. Our Lord never speaks of "body *and* spirit", but only of "body *and* soul." He never speaks of the spirit but only of the soul, as *being saved*.

But there remain a few passages in the New Testament which are by many held to teach the doctrine of trichotomy; and thereby, as they think, to lay the foundation for a specifically Christian philosophy of human nature. This doctrine, with various modifications, was maintained by several of the early fathers, and is by some urged as a solvent for almost all anthropological difficulties in theology. The passages relied upon are: 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12; Jude 19;

Jas. iii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 14, and xv. 44, 45. I believe these are all that are to any purpose as proofs. And now of these in order:—

(a) Take first the passage from 1 Thess. v. 23, “Your whole spirit and soul and body.” Here I submit that, in Scripture style, such an expression is not to be conceived of as setting forth or implying a philosophical analysis of man’s constitution, but rather as a rhetorical fulness of statement for the whole inner and outer man; just as “Thou shalt love God with all thy heart, and with all thy *soul* and with all thy mind,” is not to be understood as (with the body) implying a tetratomistic analysis of the constitution of man. And yet the mode of expression in this latter case is stronger for that purpose than in the former for a similar purpose; it points much more emphatically towards a real distinction and separation of parts than the simple phrase, “With all thine heart and soul and mind” (like “whole spirit and soul and body”) would have done. To these four (body being included) is, in one case, added a fifth, “and with all thy strength.” Does this imply the philosophy of a pentatomistic constitution of man’s being? We have just seen that both the Hebrew and the Greek terms for *soul* and *spirit* are used, both in the Old and New Testaments, as, in general, synonomous expressions for that whole living being which, as Butler says, we call ourselves. It is true that, like all so-called synonomous words,—like heart and soul and mind,—they may each have some special modification of meaning and some special proprieties of use and application. But all this is not enough to show that they denote distinct things or beings or objects of thought. We must always beware how we read our modern abstractions and nice metaphysical analyses into the concrete and popular language of Scripture. The argument from *ὅλον* (whole) as implying three parts is merely fanciful.

(b) Next comes Heb. iv. 12, “The dividing asunder of soul and spirit.” This dividing is thought to settle the question as to the real distinction between soul and spirit, by showing that they are not only logically but actually separable. But here, in fact, the whole operation is logical,—an operation by the word of God acting upon functions, and not directly upon entities, and an operation which is described in highly figurative language. In any event, it does not express a dividing asunder of the soul *from* the spirit, but a dividing *of* the soul and a dividing *of* the spirit; for it is plain that the dividing “of the joints and marrow” is not a dividing of the joints *from* the marrow, but a separation of joint from joint or of each joint in twain, and a cleaving asunder of the marrow,—as if by a strong downward stroke of a sword, the whole spine were to be cleft in the

midst. It is plain, too, that the critical discerning or distinguishing "of the thoughts and intents of the heart," is not a discriminating of thoughts from intents but of thought from thought and intent from intent; still less can it reasonably be supposed to imply that thoughts and intents are assumed to be two real and substantial divisions or constituent parts of the heart. If it be suggested that the soul and spirit are absolute units, indivisible entities, and, so, incapable of separation into parts; I answer, that neither the language of Scripture nor the ordinary speech of even these our philosophical and scientific times has anything to do with such nice distinctions. The Scriptures speak, and we speak, of a distracted mind, a divided heart, a wounded and broken spirit. In short, in my view, the text would have much the same sense if it read: "Dividing asunder of heart and soul," &c., or, "Of heart and spirit," &c.

(c) Four passages remain; in all of which the adjective "psychic" or "psychical," (*Ψυχικός*), is used in opposition to "spiritual" or "pneumatic," (*πνευματικός*.) St. Jude speaks of certain men as "psychical, not having the spirit." But surely he is not speaking of men who are destitute of a trichotomistic part of the human constitution; but of men who, in their full natural powers, are destitute of the Spirit of God, and so are of a worldly and carnal disposition. In like manner St. James describes certain men as "earthly, psychical, demon-like";—as if he had said, "not having the Spirit of God, but the spirit of evil demons." So also St. Paul, in 1 Cor. ii. 14, represents the "psychical" man as one who is not enlightened and taught by the Spirit of God, in contrast with the spiritual (or pneumatical) man who is so taught. Thus St. Jude furnishes the key, "psychical, not having the Spirit"—not having the Spirit of God.

The passage in 1 Cor. xv. 44 is somewhat different. Here the Apostle speaks of "a psychical *body* and a spiritual (or pneumatical) *body*." Now, as the psychical man is not a man who is destitute of a third part of man's normal constitution, or of a rational and moral nature, but a man who has not the Spirit of God; he is, while in this natural condition,—while not informed, illumined, energized by the indwelling of the Divine Spirit, worldly, carnal, sensual; and so he is associated in the Apostle's mind with this mortal and corruptible body. And the spiritual (or pneumatic), which the Apostle most commonly sets in an antithesis to the fleshly or carnal (*σαρκικός*—*πνεῦμα* to *σάρξ*)—is thus naturally opposed here to the psychical. The psychical body, then, is that which furnishes the organic connexion with worldly and sensible things, while the spiritual body is that which shall furnish an organic connexion with external things in a

heavenly and spiritual state;—I say, an organic connexion after the analogy of the present body in its relation to the mind or soul. For the spiritual body is *body* and not spirit, and therefore must come under the definition of *body*. If it were to be mere spirit, then every man, in the future state, would have two spirits, the spirit that he had here and another spirit received at the resurrection.

The Spirit of God is not represented as coming into direct contact with the outer man, but first with the inner man, and through that with the outer. And thus the Apostle says: “If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you.” And the operation of the Spirit of God upon the inner man, renewing, enlightening, sanctifying; changing the psychical to the pneumatical man; is not represented, and is not to be conceived of, as introducing into its subjects any new substance or faculties or constituent parts of their nature, but as renovating and restoring the deranged and perverted or mis-directed functions; the regenerate man is renewed in the spirit and temper of his mind, renewed in righteousness and true holiness, renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him, created anew in Christ Jesus. Through the power of the Holy Ghost, Christ dwells in his people as a quickening Spirit. It is presumed that man in his original condition, before he sinned, was not destitute of the Spirit. And yet, to illustrate the reality of the psychical body, the Apostle refers to Adam as he was originally created: “And so it is written,” he says, “the first man Adam was made a living soul.” Thus, in his normal original state, he was a psychical man. The *ψυχή*, *ψυχικός*, do not, therefore, necessarily carry with them a bad sense; but only when the latter is used in a distinctively negative way, as the Apostle here employs it, so that it implies the destitution of the Divine Spirit.

But now, finally, supposing that the Apostle here or elsewhere would contradistinguish soul and spirit as being distinct and co-ordinate higher and lower, parts of man’s inner nature; I should still maintain that the whole *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures requires us to consider it as a *functional* and not a *substantial* distinction. The twofold distinction into body and soul, body and spirit, body and mind, is to be regarded as a real and substantial distinction; but in the threefold distinction into “body, soul and spirit,” that between soul and spirit simply refers to different faculties, relations or activities—functions—of the inner man, who is substantially an individual unit, but whose functions are thus distributed in respect to his moral

and religious state, into two great departments, lower and higher, earthward and heavenward.

Those who scout the idea of substances as a mere metaphysical figment must of course admit the negative proposition, that the distinction in question is not substantial; and it is difficult to see how they can refuse to admit the positive proposition, that it is functional.

On the other hand, those who adopt the idea of substance, as it is commonly understood, must either admit the statement that the distinction in question is not substantial but functional, or they must hold that there are real substances in the world which are neither matter nor mind, and that either the soul or the spirit is such a substance.

I suppose that nobody has ever denied or doubted that in man's inner nature there are higher and lower powers or faculties or functions, and that it is the higher parts that are directly receptive of the impulse of the Divine Spirit. And if this is all that is meant by the trichotomists, they need not make much noise about their discovery. The real difficulty would be to draw any precise line between the higher and the lower, and to distribute all man's faculties or functions (other than the bodily) into the two departments of soul and spirit; and especially to make this distribution *as of Scripture authority* and in consonance with the actual use of these words in the Old and New Testaments, or in either of them. The commonly received and very loose division of man's nature into Intellectual, Moral and Physical does not seem to correspond to what is meant by those who make the threefold division into spirit, soul and body; for they are understood to include the higher—rational as well as moral—faculties under the spirit, while they admit that in great part the moral affections belong to the soul. But we have seen that the same affections belong also to the spirit; and St. Paul enumerates among the fruits of the spirit, "love, joy, peace," &c., and speaks of "your love in the spirit." And if it be suggested that the higher affections belong to the spirit and the lower to the soul, it is remarkable that the very highest of the affections, that which is the foremost of the spiritual graces, the very heart of the highest spiritual life, that which will endure when faith and knowledge shall vanish away—*love*, is a function of the soul. See Isa. xlii. 1, "In whom my soul delighteth"; and Song of Solomon, i. 7 and iii. 1-4, where "my soul loveth" is five times repeated. Here the Septuagist uses the verb *ἀγαπάω*.

The trichotomists are understood to admit that the will belongs to the soul; and certainly the soul is represented as the active, motive

power in man. But St. Paul “purposed in the spirit” (ἐθέτο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι). The conscience might be assigned to the spirit, but it includes a *sentiment* as well as a judgment; and, besides, the soul as the person, the ego,—as it is admitted to be,—must be the subject of the whole consciousness.

The spirit, as we have seen, may be used for the person also; but when the Divine Spirit is said to “witness with our spirits that we are the Sons of God,” it does not appear that the sense is anywise different from what it would be if the apostle had said “with our minds,” “our hearts,” or “our souls.” For the same apostle says that “God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts” (not into our spirits); and the Spirit thus imparted begets, or becomes, in us “the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father.”

The general conclusion, therefore, is, that :

(1) The words soul and spirit are generally employed in the Scriptures in an indiscriminate way, each as denoting the whole mind or inner man.

(2) In some few cases *spirit* may be used to denote especially the higher faculties or functions of the mind or soul, but even then not in direct contrast with the soul itself.

(3) In some other cases *spirit* is used for what does not at all belong to man in his natural state; but, for a certain temper, disposition and direction of the heart, imparted by the Divine Spirit in the life of Christ, by virtue of which Christians are called spiritual (or pneumat-ical) men.

But (4) there is no ground in the Scripture use of the words soul and spirit to furnish the foundation for the trichotomistic doctrine of a sharp and radical distinction between the two, as co-ordinate parts of man's nature,—much less as distinct substances in his constitution.

NOTE.—In the second Scripture quotation, p. 74, from Isa. lvii. 16, the original word for “souls” is נַשְׁמֹת.

ERRATA.

Page 3, note, line 8 from bottom, *for* Oldshausen *read* Olshausen

“ 17, No. 6, line 2, *for* θεοῦ, τὸν *read* θεοῦ . . . τὸν.

“ 34, l. 4, *for fur* *read* für, and *for* 1868–9 *read* 1869.

“ 37, line 8, *for* Septugaint *read* Septuagint.

“ 75, line 3 from bottom, and p. 79, line 3 from bottom, *substitute*
☩ *for* ☩

“ 89, No. 4, line 2, *for* is *read* Is

“ 103, note *, *add at the end*, 1 Macc. x. 69, τὸν ὄντα ἐπὶ κοίτης Συρίας.

“ 112, line 2, *for* objectionable *read* unobjectionable

“ 113, No. 2, line 2, *for* 9 *read* 6

“ 123, note *, last line, *for* Cap. *read* Chap.

“ 127, line 8, from bottom of text, place “ *after* Christ

“ 134, line 7, *for* Christian writers *read* ancient Christian writers

“ “ “ 22, *for* Cardinal Newman *read* Dr. J. H. Newman

“ “ “ 24, *after* Pseudo-Cæsarius *add* and Methodius as Pseudo-
Methodius

“ 139, 4th paragraph, last line, *for* p. 126 *read* p. 126, note †.

“ 140, 2d paragraph, line 5, *dele* Amphilochius. (See p. 137.)

“ 143, 2d paragraph, line 8, *for chirstl.* *read* *christl.*

“ 144, l. 21, *for Sunde* *read* Sünde.

“ 146, l. 9, *for Herrüber* *read* Herr über

“ “ last line, *after* N. T. *add* (1832)

“ 147, last line, *for Briefs* *read* Briefes.

Minor errors, e. g. in the Greek accents and breathings, the scholar will readily correct for himself.